Application No. 10/564,645 Paper Dated: October 16, 2008

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 4174-060105

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No. : 10/564,645 Confirmation No. 1845

Applicant : RYOICHI OKUYAMA

Filed: January 13, 2006

Title : FUEL CELL SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR DETECTING

RUNNING OUT OF FUEL IN FUEL CELL

Group Art Unit : 1795

Examiner : Steven Scully

Customer No. : 28289

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated September 22, 2008, the Examiner indicated that the Applicant was required to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted, defining two inventions as follows:

Group I Claims 5-10 drawn to a fuel cell system;

Group II Claims 11-14 drawn to a method for detecting running

out of fuel in a fuel cell system.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically submitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on October 16, 2008.

10/16/2008 Chustiu A. Casavan

Christine A. Canavan

Typed Name of Person Signing Certificate

Application No. 10/564,645

Paper Dated: October 16, 2008

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 4174-060105

The Applicant elects with traverse, Group I claims 5-11, drawn to a fuel cell

system for examination.

However, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's Restriction

Requirement because method claims 11-14 are extracted almost directly from apparatus

claims 5-8 and the only difference between these claims is the apparatus claims have means

for language which is compatible with the method claims. In accordance with §803 of the

Manual for Patent Examination Procedure (MPEP), if the search and examination of the

claims in an application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine

them on the merits even though the claims may be directed to independent or distinct

inventions.

Because of the similarity of these claims, the Applicant believes that the

search and examination of all of the claims can be made without serious burden and, for that

reason, respectfully requests the subject restriction requirement to be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

James G. Porcelli

Registration No. 33,757

Attorney for Applicant

436 Seventh Avenue

700 Koppers Building

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Telephone: (412) 471-8815

Facsimile: (412) 471-4094

E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com

Page 2 of 2